

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

FREDERICK L. COGER,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs)	Civil Action No. 18-163
)	
THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, FAMILY)	
DIVISION, ADULT SECTION, and)	
HONORABLE KIM D. EATON,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

AND NOW this 27th day of August, 2018, after Plaintiff filed *pro se* a complaint (ECF No. 1) and after Defendants filed a motion to dismiss (ECF No. 6) and brief in support thereof (ECF No. 7), and after a Report and Recommendation was filed by the United States Magistrate Judge granting the parties a period of time after being served with a copy to file written objections thereto, and, no objections having been filed,¹ upon independent review of the motions and the record, and upon consideration of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 17), which is adopted as the opinion of this Court,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendants' motion to dismiss is GRANTED and that the *pro se* complaint (ECF No. 1) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the outstanding motion for injunctive relief (ECF No. 4) and the motion for default judgment (ECF No. 16) are DISMISSED.

Finally, it is ORDERED that the Clerk shall mark this case as closed.

s/Joy Flowers Conti
JOY FLOWERS CONTI
Chief United States District Judge

¹ If a party does not file timely objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the party may lose its right to de novo review by the district court, although the court must still give "reasoned consideration" to the magistrate judge's report before adopting it. *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878-79 (3d Cir. 1987).

cc:

FREDERICK L. COGER
P.O. BOX 6837
Pittsburgh, PA 15212